DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 716 FL 012 404

AUTHOR Adelman, Clifford
TITLE Organizational Issues in International and Second Language Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C. National Council on Education Research.
PUB DATE 29 Apr 81
NOTE 40p.: Paper presented at a meeting of the National Council on Education Research (Washington, DC, April 29, 1981)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; Credentials; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Government Role; Institutional Environment; *International Education; Labor Force; *Organizational Objectives; Postsecondary Education; *Research Needs; *Second Language Programs

ABSTRACT

One of 10 studies commissioned to investigate research needs and to stimulate planning activities, this paper concerns the structures, processes, interrelationships, governance, finance, and workforces of institutions and organizations as they are engaged in international and second language education. After noting the field of instruction and research covered by the umbrella terms, "international education," and "second language education," it advances a number of hypotheses concerning the distinctiveness of the general field that conditions the way we talk about its organizational contexts. In the process, the paper describes the practitioner-constituencies that stand to benefit most from expanded research and improved information on organizational issues, and presents a consolidated discussion of existing and needed knowledge in seven major areas: (1) organizational roles, (2) governance and politics, (3) finance, (4) interorganizational relationships, (5) institutional and system environments, (6) workforce issues, and (7) credentialism. It is proposed that increased research in all areas would yield a vastly improved knowledge base for assisting local institutional leaders in thinking through their problems in these fields. It is suggested that research priorities be set by asking what organizational knowledge is necessary for progress in other aspects of the fields. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Organizational Issues in International and Second Language Education

Clifford Adelman
The National Institute of Education
Program on Educational Policy and Organization

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED203716

-I-

It seems to happen every quarter-century. Propelled by presumed crises and prodded by presidential commissions, key segments of the academic community in America have once again been mustering forces to advance the position of international and foreign language education in schools and colleges around the country. But this time is may be different. Events in the Persian Gulf and Central American states not withstanding, there has yet to be a trap-gate incident. Hostage-takings, OPEC price hikes, invasions of Cambodia and Afghanistan, a SONY-on-every-table and a Toyota-in-every-garage—these all seem endemic to the environment. And the fact that we accept them as such indicates that we may be witness to a moment in history in which international education becomes more than an ad hoc phenomenon.

The moment may be different for another reason as well: the national consciousness of other languages and other cultures has been raised by a new wave of immigration (principally refugees from drought, poverty, and oppression), and by the attempts of government at all levels and educational systems to address the problems of politically subordinate—but growingly influential—language minority groups in the United States.

FL012404

The moment may be different, then, because our society has grown up into the problem, and because the variety of organizations that sustain our social fabric now realize how great their stake in knowledge about the world, other languages, and other peoples, really is. The case for the internationally-trained and

bi- or multi-lingual American has rarely been stronger, and yet the reality has rarely been weaker. This realization has brought forth from educators a plethora of propositions for organizational and interorganizational ventures in international and second language education, visions of new settings and means by which to carry on the work they always believed to be valuable. Least these visions attain merely the status of what Seymour Sarason once called "controlled fantasies" (1), I would like to address some of the elements of the knowledge base that will be necessary to rendering the visions intelligible, feasible, and ultimately effective for the Nation.

This paper is about the contexts or settings in which international and second language education is carried out: their structures, processes, interrelationships, governance, and finance. Its basic premise is that the organizational setting both structures and sequences the delivery of knowledge. But since that assertion holds for almost any educational undertaking within organizations, one must initially ask how international and second language education differ from other fields so as to affect the way we talk about their organizational contexts.

The question arises, too, because where research on organizational issues in international education exists (and it is a rare phenomenon), it is derivative and not fundamental. That is, where we have information and analysis of international education programs, they occur in the context of generic issues--e.g. the financing of special programs, the condition of the academic workforce, the problems of certification and licensure--and largely for illustrative purposes. While the use of a field for illustrative purposes should not be disconcerting, it does not help us understand the distinctiveness of the field, and hence does not help practitioners use organizational characteristics to achieve more equitable and effective results.

Ironically, the question can best be answered by looking at the practitioners themselves, hence at the constituency for improved knowledge of the organizational settings for international and second language education. The most observable characteristic of the practitioners is that some of them are organizations themselves: not merely educational organizations (schools and colleges), but also governments, associations, corporations, and voluntary international bodies. In fact, it is thus a first principle of the distinctivity of the field that a greater variety of organizational types is involved--as actors and subjects (e.g. a government that also trains some of its employees for language-sensitive jobs)--than in any other field. In this sense, the field of international education (broadly conceived to include second language education) is uniquely self-reflexive.

A second characteristic of the practitioner-constituency is the rate of change in its status--which rises or falls with international crises or domestic controversies involving language minority groups, and the attendant public consciousness of both types of events. While the extraordinary dependency of the field on external events has been noted before (2), the rate-of-change phenomenon has not been factored in. If one does so, a second principle of distinctivity of the field can be advanced: the technology of the subjects involved will never catch up to the actors or to the changes that condition their relationships. That is, the way we go about delivering international and second language education (the technology of the subjects) lags behind a shifting scene of actors (organizations, agencies, governments--all with different demands for different knowledges). For all the normative value that educational institutions might attach to international and language studies, the fact remains, as S. Frederick Starr once pointed out, that "international studies entered American higher education because society required them at the moment, and not because the colleges and universities deemed them to be inherently valuable." (3)

The third distinctive feature of both the practitioner-constituency and the field manifests characteristics of both the first principle (self-reflexiveness) and the second (dependency on external environments). It is a combination of inequality and complexity. That is, some educational institutions possess the resources (human and supportive) to deliver international and/or second language education, and some do not; but the imbalances are often products of complex local and institutional circumstances, e.g. concentrations of minority language populations, international dependencies of local and regional economies, or the existence of established programs inherited from times in which the institutions at issue were serving different populations. This combination of inequality and complexity is also characteristic of the subjects of international education, i.e. nation states.

To sum up these three points, once might say that it is oddly difficult to analyze the complex constituency for better knowledge of organizational issues in international and second language education -

(1) because that constituency--human beings who design, deliver, administer, and finance the education--behaves in ways that are conditioned by organizational environments themselves;

(2) because the very identity of that constituency is dependent on shifting external forces;

(3) because considerable inequities exist within the ecology of organizations involved in the fields, and among the fields themselves.

Nonetheless, one can cite cases that are typical of the complexity of organizationally driven objectives of the constituents, e.g.:

- o the school superintendent who wishes to use special foreign language programs as quality alternatives within a system;
- o the college dean who seeks to develop an international management program (with Area Studies and language requirements) to balance both an excessive vocational emphasis and growing power of a School of Business Administration;

- o the school principal who wishes to combine certain elements of a bilingual program with foreign language instruction so as to lessen tensions between minority and majority language groups in the school;
- o the director of a voluntary association with international interests who wishes to advance public support for his/her organization through broader public understanding of international issues;
- o the corporate vice president for educational affairs faced with the task of training employees for a new overseas venture in a Third World country, and who, unlike most others in similar positions (4), wishes to draw on the resources of a local university.

That short list ought to indicate how critical it is that we provide practitioners with an organizational knowledge base for thinking through their problems, with conceptual frameworks within which organizational questions are raised. Those very questions—involving the roles of different kinds of educational institutions, associations, and research entities in the fields at issue, the governance environment at all levels of education, the problems of innovation and organizational adaptation—have a profound effect on who delivers international and second language education, in what forms and settings, who learns, and how well. The critical factors of organizational perspective otherwise tend to be lost in the hortatory rhetoric of the believers; and the President's Commission report fell into this trap with a loud crash, ignoring even some of its own background papers that drew heavily on organizational assumptions. (5)

II: Existing Knowledge/Needed Knowledge

What does the existing knowledge base look like in this field? An examination of some commonly used bibliographies in international and foreign language education (6) and the indexes of such publications as the ADFL Bulletin, TESOL Quarterly, Bilingual Review, Modern Language Journal, Exchange, or Language and Area Studies Review reveals preciously little research on the organizational contexts, processes, financing, and governance of international and second language education programs (policy and governance issues in bilingual education being a notable—and understandable—exception). What literature

there is consists of fragmented and occasional (and often, rather dated) surveys of the workforces and program types in educational institutions (7), a good deal of programmatic show-and-tell (i.e. "how Old Siwash delivers ESL programs to refugee populations in cooperation with Adult Basic Education operations in neighboring school systems"), or institutional research uninformed by case study methodology (e.g. the impact of Asian Studies on first year college students in a state university). Only in the hands of someone like Joshua Fishman does a generic feature like the relationship between ethnic schools (as organizations) and community infrastructures as maintaining politically subordinate languages in America emerge (8) Beyond the rhetorical policy statements--which abound--the landscape of the literature is a sparse one indeed. There is no coherent descriptive research tradition in the field, let alone analytical research.

Given that paucity of the literature, I would like to organize the review of the state of the art by indicating, for each of six major areas, what we do and do not know, and what aspects of the knowledge base are most important to build.

1) Organizational Roles: a Typology of the Field. A basic descriptive and analytical cataloguing of the huge number of non-educational organizations active in international and second-language education has never been undertaken, and yet their presence on the scene, as previously noted, is one of its distinguishing characteristics. We have some listings by specialized area, such as organizations active in the promotion of international service learning (9), and can easily construct others, such as associations involved in exchange programs, professional language-oriented associations, and interest groups and organizations active in the Bilingual and ESL areas. We have annual or occasional reports of the activities of individual organizations or projects such as those of Global Perspectives in Education, the Kettering Foundation's Institute for Development of Educational Activities, the East/West Center, or the International Education Project of ACE, to name a few. But these

are all fragments of a large picture, the boundaries of which have never been drawn.

The range of organizational types involved is considerable. Chadwick Alger has pointed out that, for example, in addition to multinational corporations and state governments, other non-governmental organizations--e.g. the AFL-CIO, Red Cross, YMCA, and AMA--have "foreign policies," and with those policies, some forms of education and educational communication. (10) And Wallace Edgerton has indicated the ways in which private sector organizations have provided professional skills development and geographical Area expertise in support of educational exchange programs. (11) From such a base, it should be possible to put together a catalogue of considerable detail, and with analytical annotations that would go far beyond the limited form of the catalogue that has been issued for Federal Programs (12).

For each type of organization, the detail would address:

(1) The purposes of the organization and the foundations of its international and/or second language interests;
(2) Programs and projects actually undertaken in the international and/or second language fields, including overtly educational and training programs, public education, exchange, development, and research;
(3) The organization and management of the units responsible for the programs and projects;
(4) The clientele of the programs and projects;
(5) To the extent to which it is not covered under #4, interactions with other types of organizations.

As for organizational types, the catalogue would cover:

- Educational voluntary organizations with specialized and internationally-oriented missions, e.g. the Asia Society, Global Perspectives in Education, American Field Service, the Institute for International Education;

- Professional Associations such as the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages, the National Council for Social Studies, the Modern Language Association, the American Association of Political and Social Science, etc.;

- Independent councils and lobbying groups, i.e. the promotional associations such as the Joint National Committee on Languages or the National Council for Foreign Language and International Studies;

- Associations of Educational Institutions and Agencies, such as the Council of Chief State School Officers, the American Council on Education, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the Education Commission of the States;

- o Voluntary organizations with international interests, including the League of Women Voters, Kiwanis, Rotary, YMCA, farm associations, etc.
- o Cultural institutions, including libraries and museums;
- o To the extent to which they bear upon or serve American Educational practices and interests, international organizations such as UNESCO, regional associations of nation-states such as OAS, and foreign governments;
- o Churches, by denomination, and exclusive of overtly missionary activity;
- o Corporations, corporate associations, and labor unions, exclusive of their philanthropic activities;
- o Foundations, corporate and independent.

The purposes of such an anlytic catalogue would be many-fold, but its chief function would be to serve as a prolegomena to research, policy-making, and planning in the organizational aspects of the fields at issue. We simply have not developed the facts or framework of analysis for what is going on now. Given a situation in which some 300 organizations and myriads of schools, colleges and universities fight over fiscal scraps, in which groups of organizations seem to pursue separate agendas (international exchange, bilingual education, specific area studies, less-commonly-taught languages, international marketing, etc.) and in which the rhetoric is always more visible than the reality, we can do little to advance the fields at issue within the broad context of American education until we have a map of the organizational territory that exists beyond the formal educational sphere of schools and colleges.

I have purposefully left a number of pieces out of this ideal analytical catalogue. First are the educational and training programs of Federal agencies which, as previously noted, have been inventoried--at least in superficial terms. Some of these programs are obviously sensitive in terms of national security and it would be difficult to gain access to them for the type of detail necessary for organizational analysis. Defense language programs, for example, have not been researched in organizational terms since the end of World War II. (13) Another reason for skipping over governmental education programs (be they Federal or state) is that they represent

cases of training-for-special-purposes, a type of organizational problem taken up below in Sections 5 and 6. To be sure, one could make the same arguments for cross-cultural training for corporate personnel development as one can for governmental programs (14), but we at least know where the governmental programs are (at the Federal level): we do not have a complete picture of the corporate world in this regard.

Secondly, I have left out the various sectors of the formal educational enterprise. The territory is simply too huge and unmanageable. We have some--- ---cataloguing of exemplary programs in international education at the college level (15) and in bilingual education (16), along with those occasional surveys of organizations like AAU, AASCU, and ACE. While not well-analyzed in organizational terms, this territory is well-known. Besides, it is more important to get at educational institutions through topics than through catalogues.

2) The Governance and Politics of International and Second Language Education. More than many other fields, both international and second language education are influenced by the twists and turns of larger political forces. While both international exchange and national language policy (discussed in other papers in this collection) highlight that characteristic, a consideration of organizational issues is dependent upon it as well. From the period of emerging national ideology of the late 19th century we inherited a notion of the sovereign tongue that ironically prevented us from perceiving the realities of a multilingual society. (17) The notion of the sovereign tongue was particularly embodied in the educational system, where non-English-speaking students were taught on the assumption that they were "foreign" and with the belief that they all possessed some history of language maintenance in this country. Indeed, in an ironic reflection of those attitudes and assumptions, our courts recognized

discrimination on the basis of national origin, but never—until recently—on the basis of language. The current spate of legislation (the Bilingual Courts Act, the Voter Rights Act, the Bilingual Education titles of ESEA, various immigrant and refugee assistance acts and others) has changed the environment by implicitly distinguishing among four language groups—colonial languages (e.g. Spanish or French), indigenous languages (the various Amerind tongues), immigrant languages (e.g. Italian, Yiddish, Polish), and refugee languages (e.g. Thai or Vietnamese)—in ways that may have a profound impact on educational organizations and systems.

Under the political pressures of a multi-lingual community, Dade County in Florida, for example, has translated such legal distinctions into five types of Second Language programs in the schools: English as a Second Language, Spanish for Native Speakers of Spanish, Spanish as a Second Language, Secondary Foreign Languages, and Bilingual Curriculum Content—all accompanied by county-wide coordinators and consultants. (18) Whether other districts with a different composition of language constituencies (e.g. San Diego) have engaged in analogous practices is an open question, but one that would be worth comparative exploration. Indeed, in 1975 the California Legislature sponsored a study of state legislation bearing or impacting on bilingual and bicultural programs. The study suggests not only that a national synposis and inter-state comparison is feasible, but that the larger synopsis can go beyond a mere listing to an analysis of impact. (19) To be sure, the analysis of impact is a huge undertaking; but the point of raising these issues is that despite some worthy attempts to do so (20), we have yet to sort them all out, nor have we attempted to understand how their phenomenological status extends beyond public policy to the internal workings—particularly those of governance and politics—of school systems or colleges and universities.

A more circuitous example of the impact of legislation and court rulings on the organization of second language and international studies at the local level involves

the conscious attempt (in a number of urban school districts) to use exemplary or "alternative" or magnet schools emphasizing bilingual and/or international studies to achieve voluntary integration. In the face of a pending court order for busing, for example, the Cincinnati schools instituted a number of alternative programs, one of which involves some 1800 students in an articulated bilingual/international studies curriculum (21). Milwaukee and Atlanta have tried similar approaches, though to what extent as a result of legal or community pressures is difficult to say.

Perhaps the overall issue might ring with a bit more clarity if we focus on the relationships between state educational authorities and local schools. Statewide plans for Global Education have been adopted in 12 states and are under consideration in eight others. We know the plans exist, can put our hands on some of the guidelines (22), have access to some of the documents from the development stages of the plans (23), yet have virtually no understanding of how the plans arose in the first place or how local school districts are interpreting and responding to them. The eight states in which the plans are under consideration (let alone 30 others) might thus profit by case studies in the development, interpretations, and implementation (on the local level) of such directives. All of these plans include statements of goals, strategies for implementation (including curricular and school-community relations issues) and cooperation with post-secondary institutions, suggested criteria for program development (including administration, dissemination, involvement of various segments of an LEA staff), and suggested procedures for assessment at the different levels of education under State Department of Education jurisdiction. Choices of whether, how, and when to emphasize the study of cultures, languages, or nations, and where and how to use co-curricular activities are significant questions for state administrators contemplating the adoption of such guidelines. (24)

But it is one task to point to models and quite another to answer such questions as how the characteristics of the model were shaped, who the pressure groups were and what they did, who ultimately decided and how, and whether there have been any identifiable patterns of reaction from local school boards (by school district type). Comprehensive case studies of the process would be far more valuable to state and local authorities than mere exchanges of models, and the Council of Chief State School Officers (which publishes occasional status reports on international education in various states) could easily assist in such studies.

Relationships between Federal authorities and local institutions are also critical, and have a very specific context in light of national security issues involved in international and second language education. John Pincus has pointed to a number of normative policy issues for Federal agencies involved in international and language work that impact heavily on local institutions, particularly on colleges and universities. (25) Changes in Federal policies and programs involving such agencies as U.S.A.I.D. or U.S.I.C.A., and in programs involving international energy planning, oceanography and other scientific assistance, and exchange of information in science, epidemology, and other health fields impact on campus organization and delivery systems, but to what extent and under what circumstances we do not yet know. More to the point of international and second language education, if foreign affairs agencies "restructure their career incentives to encourage specialization" (Pincus), what academic institutions will most likely respond and how? Or if the Federal agencies decide to provide an even greater amount of training for overseas and/or language-sensitive jobs than is now the case, how would the shift in agency resources and acquisition of staff affect previous institutional providers?

Yet another critical aspect of the governance and politics issue that has received little serious attention beyond hand-wringing is that of departmental or program power in local educational organizations. The influence of teachers and professors in matters of local governance has been partly attributed to the knowledge paradigms of their disciplines and to the ability of their departments to supply critical resources to the educational organization (26). Whether and how these hypotheses hold for international studies and second language education of different types in different educational settings has never been examined. And yet the answer is critical because language departments and international studies programs cannot begin to compensate for their presumed deficiencies so as to have a greater role in determining their futures until they know what is at issue.

The issues involved in knowledge paradigms and contributions to local institutional goals and resources vary by sector of education as they bear upon program and departmental power. In the field of second language education, the ability of bilingual, FLES, or ESL programs to contribute on the elementary school level to cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) that is the basis of an individual's academic development (27) may enhance a school's position in the competition for resources within a system. On the postsecondary level, the issue may be quite different: the extent to which language study is informed by knowledge paradigms of linguistics, psychology, or culture (28) may determine relative departmental strength.

The case of international studies programs at the postsecondary level may be influenced far more by the general tenor of academic culture in specific institutions. For example, the stronger the behavioristic tradition in the social sciences on a given campus, the less likely that international and global studies

programs (as opposed to Area Studies programs) relying on cross-cultural variables will hold much purchase on institutional resources. (29) Again—and typical of so much of the so-called knowledge-base in this field—that assertion is but a reasoned speculation: it sounds right, but has never been demonstrated. Certainly, though, the demonstration is far preferrable to claims for exemplary qualities of governance systems at some kinds of postsecondary institutions that are totally inapplicable to others. (30)

While the question of departmental power relates to that of the organization of second language and international studies within institutions and systems (see Section 4 below), I include it in the governance and politics category because (a) it bears strongly on the financing of second language and international studies, and (b) one of the frequently-hypothesized methods of compensating for lack of internal power in organizations in these program fields is to establish alliances external to the organization.

3) Finance issues in international and second language education carry a mythology, not a research tradition. International education has often been perceived as a luxury—certainly as a value-added (and not constitutive) feature of local curricula. And the mythology also categorizes second language education (with the exception of bilingual education) as a marginal need to be addressed with marginal resources.

With respect to international studies, there has been a descriptive discrimination of finance patterns by field (31) but not in a matrix with educational sector; and no one has related the finance issues to organizational characteristics. International education as it exists in the social studies departments of secondary schools, one suspects, rarely involves special funding mechanisms, whereas college departments are organized in ways that force above-formula funding

on most interdisciplinary programs. (32) At the same time, we know that claims for the effects of soft money in producing local educational change are probably inflated (33), but the grants economy has been able to support materials development in NDEA Centers and critical library resources without which programs of advanced study and research cannot function. (34) Frederick Starr has pointed out that most larger universities are currently carrying 80-90% of the costs of international programs and that some smaller colleges carry over 90%. (35) Where is the balance coming from now that the foundations have largely withdrawn from the field? What entrepreneurial operations have been found to be successful in supporting international studies on the postsecondary level? Have other non-traditional sources of funding been tapped? Do local concentrations of language minority populations or dependencies of the local economy on international developments influence patterns of internal resource allocation? In light of the organizational tensions associated with interdisciplinary programs, and (with respect to community colleges in particular) in light of tensions between localized missions and international education (36), answers to such questions are critical to the very maintenance of international studies.

Research on the financing of second-language education has focused more on internal fiscal matters, and has been dominated by Canadian studies on the costs of bilingual education by program type (e.g. immersion, extended, transitional) and their impact on other areas of school curricula (37). The same series of studies has related costs on the elementary and secondary levels to such factors as class size, teacher planning and preparation time, and the school support system (38). The limited number of American studies concern micro-budgeting and macro cost-analysis in the bilingual area. (39) The reason for that focus is not hard to deduce: bilingual education advocates, long-accustomed to existing

in a soft-money economy, measure their success by the degree to which their programs move on to regular line items in local school districts. In contrast, one might reasonably hypothesize that foreign language departments in colleges possess established institutional and budgetary niches based on enrollment-driven formulas, and index their success by contributions to institutional resources from the grants economy.

In terms of basic descriptive issues, the financing of international and second language education differs by sector, and depends greatly on the ultimate beneficiary. In the private sector, international and second language education and training is conducted principally for special purposes, and profit-making organizations will obviously invest in that training either by employee entitlements or by contracting the training functions to third parties or by developing internal capacities as providers. Inman (40) has noted that while language proficiency is hardly the most important criterion for overseas assignments, 92% of the companies she surveyed provided some form of language training allowances. Roughly 15% of the corporations surveyed were direct providers, more than half contracted for training services to third parties (principally proprietary institutions), and the balance offered directed entitlements. But the picture of discrepancies in such practices by type of employee, function of the corporate division (e.g. export, marketing in the host country, manufacturing in the host country, finance, and service), and size of corporation is an incomplete one.

Answers to questions concerning the patterns of finance are important not only to an understanding of the governance environment of the institutions at issue (as finance is the ultimate indication of what has been decided) but also to equity considerations. What Henry Levin has called the "internal equity" of formal educational systems depends upon patterns of finance that can heighten

(a) accessibility, (b) probability of enrollment, (c) participation at all levels and in all segments of the field, (d) length of participation, and (e) equal educational results. (41) Thus, an assessment of these factors with respect to groups that have been served poorly by the American educational system in the past (minorities, women, older students) and in relation to the financing of international education in particular, is a significant research agenda item.

4) Interorganizational Relationships. Various kinds of relationships among organizations, educational and non-educational, are common in the international studies fields, and, to a lesser extent, in second language education. But we have little sense of how they come about or how they determine the shape and effectiveness of educational programs. In constrictive times such as ours, academics in particular look toward organizational coalitions as utopias, and the literature is replete with propositions for establishment of these relationships, most of which seem to look for marginal resources and marginal needs of non-educational organizations to address fundamental resource gaps and fundamental needs of educational organizations. If that is the new shape of the prescriptions, we are going to suffer from vitamin deficiencies. Schools and colleges are looking for partners, and, quite frankly, do not know how to look. Perhaps some well-chosen research can help them out.

There is something of a basic literature on relationships between educational organizations in the international and second language fields, though much of it is of the dog-and-pony-show type, i.e. descriptions of isolated instances. The basic texts include the account of the outreach activities of the NDEA Centers (42), a catalogue of the types of activities which are likely to draw cooperative efforts from university-based Centers, on the one hand, and schools, school systems, libraries, and museums, on the other. This basic text has been reinforced by others which examine specific instances of invited Center assistance to schools, particularly those schools involved in the FLES programs (43). But none of these accounts gets beneath the

surface phenomena. There is no analysis, and thus very little sense of what makes for an exemplary case.

The NDEA Centers are not the only focus of organizational linkage between educational sectors. Second language education (particularly bilingual education and ESL) has often been included in Teacher Centers and Teacher Corps programs, and has, on occasion, involved postsecondary institutions (particularly community colleges) in the delivery of education to local adult populations using school facilities and resources. But as was the case in the basic question of organizational roles (see Section 1 above), we do not have a comprehensive picture of these practices, and need an analytical typology to discover what seems to work best.

The consortia phenomenon has received some attention as well, particularly in the postsecondary sector, since the have-nots are propelled to find access to resources for international education. Some of the consortia were established by academic organizations, e.g. AACJC's International/Intercultural consortium, with over 50 institutions involved. And some are regional efforts, e.g. the College Consortium for International Studies in metropolitan New York. David Hoopes' study of the Regional Council for International Cooperation has been frequently cited among the otherwise unpromising literature on such arrangements if only because Hoopes stepped back from the descriptive history of the operations of the Consortium to offer some reflections on its transferrable qualities. (44) His study would have profited even more from a comparison with activity profiles of other consortia operating in the fields. Claims have been made for the effectiveness of consortia in providing information services, consultative services, conferences, self-instruction in languages, population studies, materials, centers, faculty development, and foreign study and exchange projects, but have never been validated. The question of inequities in service constantly arises, as does what

Franklin Patterson calls the "collective rationalization of economic operations" in consortia. (45)

The inter-sectoral questions are perhaps more critical, since the interests of corporations and governments in international and second-language training often dovetail with the capacities of educational organizations in those fields. The theoretical foundations for the consideration of inter-sectoral studies in international and second language education have been advanced by this author (46), and take into account congruences in organizational type, organizational environments, internal complexity, leadership factors and institutional contexts in consideration of the most profitable potential relationships. With such fairly well-established theoretical concepts as those of organizational sets and networks (47), coalitional and federative relationships (48), and existing tools for assessing various aspects of potential organizational compatability (49), we have the capacity to analyze real cases, but so far have failed to do so. This may be a case of a derivative area of research, but one that is necessary to understand, for example, why corporations tend not to use college and university resources for training their employees in second languages (50) or the roles the proprietary sector plays in second language training (51). As a corrective to rhetoric that assumes inter-sectoral undertakings to be valuable for their own sake, such research may be able to isolate the most important variables, and, in combination with the analytical cataloguing of organizational roles (see Section 1), may yield a guide to productive undertakings whether between liberal arts colleges and farm-related organizations, community colleges and labor unions, or research universities and multi-national conglomerates. It may also enhance our understanding of the potential roles of intermediary forums, such as chambers of commerce, foreign trade associations, and councils on foreign relations, which have been suggested as promising links between the academic and business world. (52)

Such research may also bring practitioners to a greater appreciation of the complex role of leadership in interorganizational relationships--which are not simple, bloodless matters of typological or structural congruity. In an environment such as that of international and second language studies, an environment so charged with change, we are heavily dependent on risk-takers in organizations, on people who, as Arthur Stinchcombe once observed, know that "you can't build a railroad within the law," who know that new organizations and organizational functions only rise rapidly to meet an environmental condition "if they have some disrespect for traditional standards." (53)

Those who are going to lead the interorganizational movement in international and second language education must be those who (as Stinchcombe noted in a more general context) "have a low degree of commitment to the norms of the system of stratification among organizations." (54) At the beginning of this paper, I suggested that we may have reached a moment in history in which a movement has been motivated to develop new organizational forms for purposes of international understanding, commerce, and control of the environment. The status of most of these efforts is currently ad hoc, and the organizational vehicles are not so much organizations as they are voluntary associations in transit. (55) That transit will be heavily dependent on the risk-takers, and on those who believe that any type of organization --including the university and the multinational corporation--is no more important than another.

At the same time, research has demonstrated that the effects of leadership on organizational innovation are idiosyncratic, and not the result of organizational characteristics or formal authority. (56) What we're left with is the personal influence and informal effectiveness of change agents--whether in subdivisions of complex

organizations like universities or corporations or large school systems, or whether they play central leadership roles in less complex organizations like liberal arts colleges or voluntary associations. It may thus be profitable for us to identify such individuals, and to provide them with productive conceptual tools for understanding how international and second language education has been organized in different types of institutions.

5) The Institutional Environment and Local Organization . Having considered inter-sectoral issues, we now break our subjects back out into sectors, in order to perceive what is known and what we need to know about the organization of international and second-language education in different types of institutions.

Perhaps the best place to begin is in the Third Sector (non-educational institutions) where international and second language education is carried out for special purposes. Consider, for a moment, who delivers the so-called Language-for-Special-Purposes (LSP) programs and under what circumstances: airlines for ticketing agents and attendants on international flights, corporate vocational education programs for blue-collar workforces scheduled for foreign assignments (particularly in the construction and petroleum industries), hospitals in areas serving significant numbers of language minorities, and the military--not only for intelligence-gathering purposes, not only to enable combat servicemen to survive in hostile environments, but for a complete range of interactions with local populations and officials. There is a large literature on LSP programs, but all of it focuses on curricular considerations, on issues of whether sociolinguistic, psychological, and technical aspects of the curriculum should be integrated with the language learning, and if so, in what ways (notional/functional, communicative competence, etc.) (57) The intensive nature of the LSP programs is assumed, a distinction between intensive methods and intensive delivery systems has been established (58), and distinctions among immersion, accelerated, concentrated, etc.

programs have been drawn. But comparative studies of program effectiveness in terms of those distinctions have not been carried out; nor, in light of workforce issues (see Section 6 below) have we evaluated the optimal combinations of technical and language training, and the ways in which private sector organizations decide on what is enough training. (59)

In the higher education sector one looks first at the ways in which international and second language education fields are structured and administered in different types of institutions. Depending on how a college or university looks at international education—within the context of its mission--there are four types of activities at issue. And depending on the degree of organizational complexity, these activities may be integrated or differentiated:

(1) Curricular activities. The structures here involve not only departments, but concentrations shared among departments (e.g. Area Studies), subfields of disciplines (e.g. international economics), loosely-federated international curricula within School units (e.g. international management in Schools of Business Administration), and even more loosely organized dimensions of General Education curricula.

(2) Extracurricular activities. These fall principally in the student services area, and involve exchanges, the governance of foreign student affairs, and placement of students graduating with backgrounds in international or foreign language studies.

(3) Service Activities. Such functions range from protocols for international visitors to private contracts for translation and interpreting to brokering interests between foreign institutions and organizations and their domestic counterparts. A heavy emphasis within these activities falls in services to school districts, including library, staff, resource, and curricular development. Some of these service functions have been well-described in the outreach activities of the NDEA Centers (60), though the locus for their administration may vary according to institutional type and complexity.

(4) Research and Technical Assistance. Such activities range from U.S.A.I.D. contracts under bi-lateral agreements to individual faculty efforts. Whether there is any organizational consistency in the impetus for these activities is an open question, though they may well be coordinated or monitored by a Research Office—where one exists.

When one looks carefully at that conglomeration of functions, centralization of administration seems well-neigh impossible, though as Barbara Burn (61) and others

(62) have pointed out, roughly one-fourth of American colleges and universities have experimented with ooordinative offices of international programs at one time or another since the passage of the ill-funded International Education Act of 1966. While we know who has done what in terms of attempts at centralization, integration, or federation of these activities (63), we do not know with what effectiveness.

Burn has asked whether the existence of multiple programs on a single campus was an indication of cooperative diffusion or raw competition (64), and the question, while yet to be answered, has become more critical in the current Hobbesian environment in colleges and universities. Lambert (65) found that in complex academic settings with competing types of international programs (Area Studies, international studies, Global Problem studies), one type usually dominated. But if one adds ethnic studies to the mix and international programs in professional schools (66), the case for dominance may demand a mode of analysis that draws on subtleties of faculty culture and politics.

After all, it is in the nature of curricular "concentrations" to be subordinated within the larger units of colleges and universities. And it is the nature of faculty to evidence professional and disciplinary loyalties that undermine their commitment to non-disciplinary-based programs. Global education, as problem-centered curricula, for example, tend to wind up in interdisciplinary, General Education, or ad hoc programs where the knowledge paradigm is exceedingly weak and the organizational base a chimera. On the other hand, where Centers and Institutes are involved, these curricula may be less subordinated. Centers and Institutes tend to act independently of other organizational units, and to orient themselves more toward external environments than to internal organization. (67) But when they contribute to overall institutional mission and resources, leadership, and breadth of recruitment, their power increases--as does that of

the programs in which they are involved. In the case of international education, however, these are but reasoned speculations: the case has yet to be demonstrated. And yet for the sake of strengthening the international and second language dimensions of General Education programs in particular, this author has argued that such research is important. (68)

When foreign language departments are factored into local organization, the situation becomes more complex still. There are three types of foreign language department structures in postsecondary institutions: the single language department, the multiple language department (in which questions of the independence of the different language teaching groups arises) and inclusive structures such as Divisions of Humanities such as are found in community colleges. The relationship between these structures and actual language department operations (e.g. a variety of types of program offerings) or inter-departmental relations (e.g. degree of inclusion in the formal and informal working environments of the institution) have not, to my knowledge, been explored beyond elementary analyses of governance, tenure of department chair, retention policy, etc. Instead, the literature on college language departments seems obsessed with issues of class size, support facilities, and laboratory use patterns, and--of course--promotional efforts. (69) Despite the volume of literature on the latter (the proliferation of departmental and professional public relations campaigns) the virtues and limitations of such efforts have yet to be systematically evaluated. (70) What might be valuable for local departments, though, is an analytical chronicle of shifts in the professional orientation of language departments, of faculty consciousness of organizational roles as reflected in their promotional efforts, and of the changing mission of the disciplines involved in postsecondary institutional environments.

In the school sector, the interdisciplinary status of the fields is assumed, and the discussions in the literature focus on questions of structure and innovation. The literature on international studies in the schools, for example, is frequently intertwined with the literature on futurism, on reorganizing school curricula and departments for interdisciplinary teaching of and toward the future. While the philosophical bases for that curricular connection are clear, the organizational implications are not. We know of some reorganizations of this type on the postsecondary level, where small and highly controllable environments are necessary for institutionalization of the innovation to take hold, e.g. at Davis & Elkins, a small liberal arts college in West Virginia, or in the cluster college experiment at the University of Maryland/Baltimore County. But larger school organizations do not hold out such friendly environments, and a great deal of staff and administrative development is necessary to open school faculties to the possibilities of reorganizing the instructional process, the behavioral regularities of which are formidable obstacles. (71)

Global and cross-cultural studies have also engendered departures from traditional organizational forms or delivery systems within schools and school systems, Research on their success has not, to my knowledge, been undertaken. And yet from what we know of innovations in postsecondary settings, such non-structural factors as informal faculty working groups and informal ties between teachers and community organizations might have a profound effect. But again, on this topic we have a great deal of advocacy and speculation in the literature, not research, and a strong tendency to underestimate the complex managerial problems of interdisciplinary education. (72) The latter is not surprising in light of the very dim organizational consciousness of both school teachers and college faculty. (73)

6) Workforce Issues. Compounding these organizational issues are a series of observations one can too easily make on the nature of the academic workforce in international and foreign language education, particularly features relating to its demographics and the history of its training. James Hester may have waxed a bit lyrical on the issue in its postsecondary context when he noted that

> our universities are staffed to a considerable extent by men and women whose mental furniture was put into place in another era, whose highly specialized disciplinary skills frequently exclude potential comparative international perspectives. (74)

But more mundane knowledge abounds. There have been too many surveys of foreign language and area studies teachers and professors, surveys that have described too little. We know that international studies faculty in our universities are older, and that the field distributions of those faculty at major research universities are skewed toward the humanities (75), but we have no comparable data for other collegiate and school sectors. We know who has produced the doctorates and master's degrees, but know little about sectoral interchanges or about the career paths of such individuals. One can reasonably suspect that the workforce is less likely to take risks in contracting environments, that it grudgingly accepts student vocational interests, and that opportunities for new blood and energy are limited, but such speculations demand proof. Both equity considerations (i.e. the access of women and minorities to academic or teaching careers in these fields) and the problem of maintaining doctoral programs in the "smaller doctorate-granting institutions" (76) are at issue here, though in the cases of bilingual education and TESOL careers, those considerations and problems are far less severe.

Where our knowledge is considerably lacking is in the area of international and second language faculty in non-school settings. We can only speculate on the shape, origins, mobility, or organization of the academic workforce

in corporate institutes, government training programs (including the Foreign Service Institute or the Defense Language Institute), church programs, or in the so-called "second sector" (proprietary institutions). The issue is important for two reasons. First, we know we lack an appropriate instructional workforce for LSP programs that require people trained in both language pedagogy and the scientific, technical, and/or economic subjects at issue (77). Paraprofessionals have been a tradition in the international and second language education teaching force (78), and paraprofessionals, one suspects, cannot deliver the complex education required in the LSP fields, whether the students are native speakers of English or not. At the same time, we know that the majority of our language teachers in schools and colleges have had a literary bias in their training. Since the future of LSP programs is promising, and since no matter what we do to promote the study of international issues and second languages the demographics of the situation are such that we will have teacher surpluses in our schools and colleges, we ought to know who is teaching in LSP and cultural training programs now so as to engage in informed manpower planning.

The second reason the issue is important relates to the larger topic of credentialism and accreditation. While this issue has been raised in other papers, there is no question that we need a map of state and local language proficiency policies for both students and teachers in all types of educational settings, a comparative map of the types of credentials awarded by Second and Third Sector institutions for second language and/or international studies, and an identification of some exemplary ways by which state policies have sought to reconcile compensatory and enrichment approaches to second language proficiency. Beyond such maps, the credentials and standards for hiring and licensing those who teach outside school settings have never been investigated. It is an important issue for the consumer of education, the student.

And the student in the primary and secondary schools is greatly dependent, in this regard, on the accreditation standards for schools of education. Some years ago, AACTE took an accounting of what its member institutions were doing in international education, and found a relatively small impact on future teachers (79). By 1980, AACTE had introduced revised accreditation standards that included at least a multi-cultural education requirement. It behooves us to monitor what will happen as a result, and to ask what parallels might lurk in the process for other professional school accreditation bodies, e.g. the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, whose constituency has tragically little international training and background (80).

* * *

We know from both our own history and that of other nations that the more central governments cut back institutional support, the more institutions seek to prove their usefulness in the labor market, in improving economic conditions, and in advancing social services, education among them. Since the trend of retrenchment is ever more upon us, institutions want to know how to do their jobs better, and to what extent international studies and second language education play a role in each of their responses and objectives. The point of citing our knowledges and lacks of knowledge is to provide a ground for helping them. Despite the idiosyncratic nature of the policies and programs that might result from an improved knowledge bace, we need not be disconcerted as long as our ultimate focus is on what happens to real learners.

III: Priorities and Recommendations

After the recitations of such lacks in knowledge, what? The will tends to be infinite as it drives the mind to know all. But knowledge of a field is never complete, and in part because the mind instinctively sifts, chooses its tasks. The advocates of a field would uncover each stone of knowledge for its

own sake. But national research planning must involve a more cautious approach. Thus, to be frank, despite the fact that the whole area is relatively terra incognita with respect to quality organizational research, there are not that many issues for which the research need is pressing. Besides, research is not the only function of NIE, and the recommendations that follow include activities such as technical assistance and dissemination. Where the recommendations address the Institute's research functions, they are informed by three principles:

1) The Principle of Foundations, that is, to ask what knowledge it is that other research and development in the international and second language education fields cannot proceed without;

2) The Principle of The Exemplary, that is, within the Foundations, research must seek to identify and analyze exemplary programs and practices in terms of their generic organizational features and processes;

3) The Principle of Timeliness, that is, that research priorities be determined, in part, by the likelihood of closing the gap between the advancement and use of knowledge, the likelihood that research results will be disseminated in a timely fashion.

In addition, all recommendations seek to avoid duplication of activities of other Federal agencies and non-Federal organizations, and to respect the traditional "territories," so to speak, of other agencies. What that means in very concrete terms, for example, is that it is not the function of NIE to monitor what colleges and universities are doing in the international and second language education fields, to maintain rosters of those programs and descriptions of their activities. It is not the function of NIE to sponsor research on technology transfer or comprehensive studies of the educational systems of other countries. Nor is it NIE's function to sponsor linguistic research abstracted from its educational context. All of those activities are already covered by other agencies and organizations.

The specific recommendations make sense only in the context of a set of operating guidelines in a period of extraordinarily tight budgets, and a period

in which the consciousness of the non-intrusive Federal role in education is extraordinarily keen. These operating guidelines should be adopted for all activities under the new Congressional directive, and not merely those dealing with organizational issues. They include:

1) The maximum feasible use of in-house and staff recourses. If NIE staff can do some--if not all--of a specific job in these fields, then existing program budgets need not be burdened with grants or contracts to external parties. Assuming that grants program activity will diminish at the Institute in direct proportion to budget cuts, staff should have more time to engage in directed research, dissemination, and service activities.

2) A value-added approach to existing programs. On the assumption that funds for new starts can be pried loose at all from FY 82 and FY 83 budgets, and to the extent to which research priorities in the fields at issue are congruent with existing grants programs, then international and/or second-language dimensions should be added to those programs, and applications in those fields encouraged.

3) The leveraging of limited assets with matching grant formulas (to attract private capital) and cooperative funding arrangements with other Federal agencies. This strategy involves (a) the search for the critical interests of other agencies (such as the Departments of Defense, State, and Commerce) as they bear upon international and second language education, and (b) an authority and mechanism for negotiating with those other agencies, and carrying out joint projects.

4) The establishment of lines of communication among organizations, associations, and agencies likely to be affected by or to use knowledge generated by NIE activities. This does not mean more planning conferences, rather an exercise, in principle, of the Institute's recognized convening authority in matters of educational research and dissemination.

5) A truly Federalistic stance under which the Institute seeks to gather and synthesize information, and to serve as a resource to states, local institutions, and associations.

Given these operating guidelines, one might suggest the following set of projects involving some of the organizational issues discussed previously in this paper. The list is meant to be illustrative, not exhaustive or definitive. It is a limited list (quite purposefully, in light of limited budgets and person-power), and one that refers the reader back to the pages in this document on which the issues were discussed.

1) The cooperative production of a descriptive and analytical catalogue of the activities of non-educational organizations in the international and second-language education fields. The detail on the contents of this cataloguing is presented on pages 7-8 of this paper. It is proposed that NIE donate staff time for this undertaking, to be matched with funds and/or in kind by interested agencies such as the Department of Commerce, the Office of International Education, and U.S.I.C.A. Once the survey, analysis, and cataloguing tasks have been completed, each of the cooperating agencies might contribute no more than $5,000 toward the joint publication and distribution of this catalogue by appropriate associations in the field, e.g. the American Council on Education, the American Society for Training and Development, etc. A second stage of this project could involve the joint sponsorship of a descriptive study of the workforce in international and second language education in so-called Third Sector institutions and organizations, e.g. corporations, public agencies, voluntary associations, etc. (see page 27 above).

2) The Institute could direct selected Regional Laboratories under its jurisdiction to study the processes by which statewide Global Education guidelines have been developed in their respective regions, and, on the basis of the generic features emerging from those case studies, to assist other State Departments of Education that are considering the development of similar guidelines. The funding for the study and assistance could be in the form of a directed set-aside within each affected Lab's budget, and the entire effort could be coordinated by the Council of Chief State School Officers or the Educational Commission of the States (see page 11).

3) The Institute might form a staff research team to identify and analyze exemplary interorganizational undertakings in international and/or second

language education (see pp. 17-21 above). The objective of such research would be a casebook grounded in organizational theory that would also yield some principles for future interorganizational ventures both within the formal educational sector (e.g. between school systems and colleges) and between sectors (e.g. between universities and corporations). The studies here could contribute to the more fundamental field of interorganizational research as well as to the improvement of current practices. Some modest external consultory assistance might be required, and, for that purpose, cooperative support from other interested agencies, e.g. the Departments of Commerce and/or State, could be sought.

4) In cooperation with an appropriate educational association, e.g. the CSSO or ECS, the Institute could formulate a directed study that would compare the impact of State laws on international and second language (with emphasis on bilingual and TESOL) education programs. The RFP could be written with a matching formula so as to attract private capital. (see page 10 above) Through a similar arrangement, a synthesis of knowledge on funding strategies for international or second language education in local institutions could be undertaken, with results distributed directly to those institutions by the cooperating association.

5) An NIE-convened Research Forum on current issues in international and second language education could seek to bring greater consciousness of organizational concepts to practitioners in the field. While such a Forum should cover more than organizational issues, it could draw on both NIE staff and others to present think-pieces, case studies, and surveys to administrators, teachers of affected subjects, and representatives of educational and professional associations in a seminar format. If travel funds are available, such a Forum could be conducted on a regional

basis. Funds for the travel of attendees might be sought from private sources. The purpose of such a dissemination-and-technical-assistance activity would be to provide practitioners with more sophisticated conceptual frameworks for thinking through local problems than they now possess (see pp. 25-27 above for examples of some of the issues that might be taken up).

That is a limited list, indeed. But it is one informed by the environment of caution and selectivity in which the Institute exists, along with the principles and operating guidelines discussed above. A few projects from that list, coupled with others suggested in these papers, could go a long way toward a genuine response to a Congressional directive, and go a longer way, still, toward the improvement of the knowledge base in the fields of education at issue. To stand still at the edge of change is not a situation that this nation can afford. Nor the world, for that matter.

NOTES

1. Sarason, Seymour, The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978, p. 6.

2) Sanders, Irwin T. and Ward, Jennifer C., Bridges to Understanding. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970, p. 215.

3) S. Frederick Starr, "Who is Tending the Store?" Change, vol. 12, no. 4 (1980), p. 29.

4) Samuel L. Hayden and Leslie W. Koepplin, "International Business, Foreign Languages and International Studies/Analysis of Relationships and Recommendations," in President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, Background Papers and Studies. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1979, p. 239.

5) These included Melvin Fox's comparative organizational study, "Indiana Language Program and Washington Foreign Language Program," James Harf's review of "Undergraduate International Studies: the State of the Art and Prescriptions for the Future," and the collaborative paper by Samuel Hayden and Leslie Koepplin mentioned above. See President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, Background Papers and Studies, pp. 31-48, 90-109, and 235-246.

6) For example, Julia A. Petrov (compiler) and Kathleen McLane (editor), Foreign Language, Area, and Other International Studies: a Bibliography of Research and Instructional Materials, List. No. 8, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1978; Pat. K. McIntyre, International Education Resources, Cumulative Second Edition, 1956-1977, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1980; Howard L. Nostrand, et al, Research on Language Teaching, Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press, 1965 (somewhat dated, but both international and comprehensive in coverage); Dale L. Lange and Ray T. Clifford (compliers), Testing in Foreign Languages, ESL, and Bilingual Education, 1966-1979: a Select, Annotated ERIC Bibliography, Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1980; Ernest J. Wilkins, et al, Foreign Language Instruction and Career Preparation: a Selected, Annotated Bibliography, Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977; and such annual bibliographies as the ACTFL bibliography of books and articles on pedagogy in foreign languages (1968-1976), the ESL bibliographies (in this case, 1975), etc.

7) For example, William D. Love and Lucille J. Honig, Options and Perspectives: a Sourcebook of Innovative Foreign Language Programs in Action, K-12. New York: the Modern Language Association, 1973; George W. Angell, 1970 Census of International Programs in State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.: the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1971; H. Tierney, G. A. Lund, and M. N. Ball, Manpower in the Neglected Languages, 1963-4, New York: the Modern Language Association, 1964 (again, somewhat dated, but a good representative of the genre); and Stephan F. Brumberg, ICED Data Bank on International Programs of Higher Education Institutions, New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1972.

8) Fishman, Joshua A., "The Significance of the Ethnic Community Mother Tongue School," NABE Journal, Vol. III, no. 3 (Spring, 1979).

9) Service Learning for the Future: Domestic and International Programs. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1978.

10) Alger, Chadwick, "Extending Responsible Public Participation in International Affairs," Exchange, Vol.XIV (1978), pp. 17-21.

11) Edgerton, Wallace B., "The Role of the Private Sector in Educational Exchange," International Education and Cultural Exchange, vol. 14, no. 1 (1978), pp. 5-9.

12) Wiprud, Helen R. (compiler), International Education Programs of the U. S. Government: an Inventory. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1980. The volume covers 181 programs ranging from Fulbright Scholars (USICA) to training activities for international civil aviation personnal (FAA) to cooperative atmospheric research (NSF) to symposia designed to increase the international awareness and knowledge of Americans (NEH).

13) See J. Axelrod, "The Navy Language School and College Foreign Language Departments: Personnel and Organization," Modern Language Journal, vol. 29 (1945), pp. 127-132.

14) See Feldman, Milton J., "Training for Cross-Cultural International Interaction in the Federal Government," Training and Development Journal, vol. 30, no. 11 (1976), pp. 19-22.

15) Council on Learning, Handbook of Exemplary International Programs. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1981.

16) See The Identification and Description of Exemplary Bilingual Education Programs. Palo Alto, Calif: American Institutes for Research, 1975.

17) See Fishman, Joshua A., Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton, 1965. Also Kenneth D. Chastian, "Second-Language Study: Historical Background and Current Status," in Gruner, F. (ed.), Learning a Second Language. The Seventy-Ninth Yearbook of NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980, pp. 1-23.

18) Gil, Felicia D., "Dade County Field Verification Report," in Bilingual Instructional Features Planning Study, Paper #5. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, 1980, pp. 66-69.

19) Assembly of the California State Legislature, Synopsis of Legislation Impacting Bilingual-Bicultural Programs by Category. Sacramento, Calif.: California State Legislature, 1975. ED 122601

20) Steven A. Grant, "Language Policy in the United States," ADFL Bulletin, vol. 9, no. 4 (1978), pp. 1-12.

21) Remarks of James Jacobs, Superintendent of Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio at a seminar on "Bilingual and Foreign Language Education: Innovations in an Urban School System," at the National Institute of Education, March 6, 1981.

22) E.G., Guidlines for Global Education. Lansing, Mich.: State of Michigan Department of Education, n.d. (c. 1979).

23) E.g., "Encouraging International Education in Pennsylvania's Postsecondary Institutions: Will the State Board of Education Adopt a Policy Statement on International Education?" duplicated, April 3, 1978.

24) Kenneth H. Hansen, "State Education Agency Involvement in International Education," an issue analysis paper prepared for the Chief State School Officers of Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Oregon, Montana, and Washington. Portland, Ore.: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Sept., 1980, duplicated.

25) John Pincus, "RAND Meets the President's Commission: the Life Cycle of a Non-Event," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 449 (May, 1980), pp. 80-90.

26) See, e.g. Janice M. Beyer and Thomas M. Lodahl, "A Comparative Study of Patterns of Influence in United States and English Universities," Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (1976), pp. 104-129; and Gerald R. Salancik and Jeffrey Pfeffer, "The Bases and Use of Power in Organizational Decision Making: the Case of the University," in Administrative Science Quarterly 19 (1974), pp. 453-473.

27) James Cummins, "The Cross-Lingual Dimensions of Language Proficiency," TESOL Quarterly, vol. 14 (1980), pp. 175-187.

28) Pillet, Roger, Foreign Language Study: Perspective and Prospect. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974, pp. 27-48.

29) Starr, p. 29.

30) For a classic of this genre, and as applied to foreign language departments in universities, see Barbara Elling, "The Department and Faculty Governance," ADFL Bulletin, vol. 12, no. 1 (1980), pp. 14-16.

31) Richard D. Lambert, "Patterns of Funding of Language and Area Studies," Journal of Asian Studies, vol. 30 (1971), pp. 399-412.

32) David W. Cravens, et al, "Organizing for Interdisciplinary Research in a University Setting," Journal of the Society of Research Administrators, vol. 8, no. 1 (1976), pp. 3-10.

33) Terrence E. Deal, John W. Meyer and W. Richard Scott, "Organizational Influences on Educational Innovation," in Baldridge, J. Victor and Deal, Terrence E. (eds.), Managing Change in Educational Organizations. Berkeley: McCutchan Pubs., 1975, pp. 109-132.

34) See, e.g. Frederick H. Wagman, "The General Research Library and the Area Studies Programs," in Tsien, T-H. and Winger, H. W. (eds.), Area Studies and the Library. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966, pp. 141-152.

35) Starr, p. 32.

36) See Benjamin R. Wygal, "Weathering the Heavy Seas of International Education," New Directions for Community Colleges, vol. 7, no. 2 (1979), pp. 109-115.

37) Partlow, H. R., The Costs of Providing Instruction in French to Students Studying French as a Second Language: an in-depth study of seven Ontario school boards. Toronto: Ontario Department of Education, 1977.

38) Halpern, G. et al, Alternative School Programs for French Language Learning. Toronto: Ontario Department of Education, 1976.

39) See Jose A. Cardenas, "Budgeting for Bilingual Education" and Joseph D. Garcia, "Analyzing Bilingual Education Costs," in Blanco, George (ed.), Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977, Vol. IV.

40) Marianne Inman, "Foreign Languages and the U. S. Multinational Corporation," in President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies: Background Papers and Studies, p. 254.

41) Henry M. Levin, "Financing Higher Education and Social Equity: Implications for Lifelong Learning," University of Chicago School Review, vol. 86, no. 3 (1978), pp. 327-347.

42) Mehlinger, Howard, Descriptions of Outreach Activities of 45 Centers for Language and Area Studies. Bloomington, Ind.: Mid-America Center for Global Education, 1976 (duplicated). For a case study that touches upon the locus and complexity issue see Oxnam, R. B., University Outreach Programs on East Asia: Linkages with School and Community. Racine, Wisc.: Windspread Conference Center, 1975. ED 129 206.

43) "Ten Years of NDEA Language Institutes (1959-1968): Four Perspectives and a Memorial to the Architect," Hispania, vol. 52, no. 3 (1969), pp. 357-383.

44) Hoopes, David S., A Study of the Dynamics of Interinstitutional Cooperation for International Education Development. Pittsburgh: Regional Council for International Cooperation, 1971. ED 049 716

45) Patterson, Franklin K., Colleges in Consort. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974, p. 94.

46) Clifford Adelman, "Choosing Your Partner: Interorganizational Issues in International Education," paper presented to the 1981 Conference of the American Association for Higher Education.

47) H. E. Aldrich and David A. Whetten, "Organizational Sets, Action Sets, and Networks: Making the Most of Simplicity," in Nystrom, P. and Starbuck, W., Handbook of Organization Design. London: Oxford University Press, 1981, Vol. I.

48) Roland I Warren, "The Interorganizational Field as a Focus of Investigation," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 12 (1967), pp. 396-419.

49) I. A. Akinbode and R. C. Clark, "A Framework for Analyzing Interorganizational Relationships," Human Relations, vol. 29 (1976), pp. 101-114.

50) Inman, p. 250.

51)

52) S. Hayden and L. Koepplin, p. 238.

53) Arthur L. Stinchcombe, "Social Structure and Organizations," in March, James G. (ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1965, p. 174.

54) Stinchcombe, p. 148.

55) The distinction between organization and voluntary association has been discussed by a number of leading sociologists in terms of degree of specificity of objectives and commitment of memberships. See, e.g. Hage, J. and Aiken, M., Social Change in Complex Organizations. New York: Random House, 1970, Chap. 1.

56) Deal, et al, p. 122.

57) Inman, pp. 287-292.

58) Bensaler, David P. and Schulz, Renate A., Intensive Foreign Language Courses. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1979.

59) Inman points out that the average time spent in corporate language training programs is 3 months or less and the actual amount of instruction from 100-120 hours, as compared with a minimum of 6 months and 500 hours at the Foreign Service Institute or the Defense Language Institute. (Inman, p. 257)

60) See Mehlinger (note #42 above).

61) Burn, Barbara, Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980, p. 143.

62) Sanders, Irwin T. and Ward, Jennifer C., Bridges to Understanding. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970, p. 188.

63) Committee for International Studies and Programs Administrators, "International Studies Survey Results," CISPA Newsletter, January, 1978, as cited in Burn, p. 144.

64) Burn, p. 147.

65) Lambert, Richard D., Language and Area Studies Review. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1973, p. 276.

66) The trend in NDEA graduate-level funding has moved toward professional-school-based programs. Ann I. Schneider, "Lessons Learned from U.S.O.E.-Funded Graduate International Studies Programs," paper presented to the 1981 Conference of the American Association for Higher Education.

67) See Ikenberry, Stanley O. and Friedman, Renee C., Beyond Academic Departments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972, Chap. 5.

68) Clifford Adelman, "Saving the Baby: Language Study and the New Reformings of General Education," ADFL Bulletin (in press; May, 1981).

69) See, e.g. John Grandin, et al, "Direction and Focus for a Department of Foreign Languages," ADFL Bulletin, vol. 10, no. 3 (1979), p. 30.

70) As this author has observed, if Foreign Language departments plan "in terms of FTEs for their own sake," they wind up with "an advertising campaign, not a curriculum policy." Clifford Adelman, "Institutional Language Policy in an Egalitarian Age," ADFL Bulletin, vol. 10, no. 3 (1979), p. 34.

71) On the relationship between programmatic and behavioral regularities in the natural process of change in schools, see Sarason, Seymour B., The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971, p. 75.

72) See Helene Z. Loew, "Modifying the Program and Providing for Change," the ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series No. 10. New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1979.

73) In 1978, the National Council forSocial Studies surveyed teachers' and administrators' perceptions of what was being done and what was needed in global education on the elementary and secondary school levels. More that half the teachers surveyed failed to answer questions on policy-making alternatives at the local, state, and Federal levels. See Final Report of the NCSS Ad Hoc Committee Survey on Global Education. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1978.

74) James M. Hester, "To Illuminate Tomorrow: Higher Education in an Interdependent World," in Bailey, Stephen K. (ed.), Higher Education in the World Community. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977, p. 8.

75) Elinor Barber and Warren Ilchman, "Preservation of the Research University," Annals of the American Academic of Political and Social Science, vol. 449 (May, 1980), pp. 56-79. Barber and Ilchman point out that the projected retirement rate of international studies faculty over the next decade will be 50% above the national average for all faculty.

76) Harmon, Lindsay, A Century of Doctorates. Washington, D.C.: The National Academy of Sciences, 1978.

77) P. Stevens, "Special Purpose Language Learning: a Perspective," Language Teaching and Linguistics, vol. 10 (1977), pp. 145-163.

78) Benseler and Schulz, p. 21.

79) Klassen, Frank H. et al, The International Dimension of American Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1973.

80) S. Hayden and L. Koepplin, p. 240.